

Stakeholder Feedback – 03-30-2008:

Scope

- How many Utah businesses?
- Criteria for thresholds, unintended consequences

Electricity

- Economic analysis impact on customers
- Combined heat and power fit
- RPM prefers a national approach
- WCI should sync up—prefer generator approach
- Timeframe for national?
- Rocky Mountain Power needs to address technology development aggressively to solve
- Western Resource advocates skeptical of first jurisdiction/seller
Look at emission standard to address leakage—comments posted

Reporting

- Level of involvement for Department of Air Quality
- Recognition of early reductions
- Defer to allocations
- Leave climate registry report under WCI
- EPA to develop national reporting? How will it fit? WCI will try to influence two reporting systems—not what anyone wants.
- Harmonize

Allocations

- Utah's baseline—when is it set?
- Dirty input limits—stop fossil fuel from leaving ground
- Performance-based provisions
- Ex-emissions per megawatt hour produced
- Senator Brambles Bill—how does it play into this?

Offsets

- Rocky Mountain Power preference on verifying mechanism—not there yet?
- Tie-in back to scope
- Tension between growth and technical progress depends on people pushing forward and doing it
- Preferred boundary for offsets. Is there a divergence of opinions?
- Well-designed program has significant benefits
- Potential problem with grandfathering

Action Item: Regular briefing with stakeholders; notice through listserv